

Remarks

In the Office Action dated July 26, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 26, 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the document in the name of Mengel in view of the document in the name of Juha, et al. The Examiner rejected claims 5, 15, 22-25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mengel in view of Juha, et al. and further in view of the U.S. Patent to Montillo, et al. 6,526,165. The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mengel in view of Juha, et al. and further in view of the U.S. Patent in the name of Proskey 4,159,648. The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mengel in view of Juha, et al. and further in view of the U.S. Patent in the name of Roy, et al. 5,956,134. The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mengel in view of Juha, et al. and further in view of the U.S. Patent in the name of Kent, et al. 6,047,084. The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mengel in view of Juha, et al. and further in view of the U.S. Patent in the name of Paulsen, et al. 6,522,777.

By this Amendment, Applicants' Attorney has cancelled all of the pending claims and has substituted therefore new claims 29-51.

Briefly, each of the independent claims of the application currently require processing 2-D and 3-D data in combination to form or identify blob and edge images which are evaluated to find the locations of the components. None of the references of record taken either alone or in combination with one another disclose this feature.

For example, the reference in the name of Mengel teaches the use of 2-D data needed to measure some attributes while 3-D data is needed for other attributes. An examination of Figure 2, page 788 of the Mengel reference reveals the use of 3-D data to obtain maximum height, gradient, volume and shape. 2-D data is used to determine contours and detection of distortion. Either 2-D or 3-D data, but not both, is utilized for histograms and

edges. Consequently, Mengel does not recognize the processing of both 2-D data and 3-D data in combination to identify or form blob and edge images.

While the Juha, et al. reference (discussed on pages 3-4 of the specification) may disclose thresholding, which is well known in the art, Juha, et al. does not process 2-D and 3-D in combination to form or identify blob and edge images which are evaluated to find the locations of the components which is only provided by each of the independent claims of the application. Neither Mengel nor Juha, et al. discloses this feature.

Also, none of the other references of record teach, disclose or discuss the above-noted feature present in each of the independent claims.

Consequently, in view of the above and in the absence of better art, Applicants' Attorney respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance which allowance is respectfully requested.

A check in the amount of \$1,020.00 is enclosed to cover the Petition fee. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

John J. Weisgerber, et al.

By



David R. Syrowik

Reg. No. 27,956

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: January 12, 2006

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351